

Daniel Ellsberg at FFF Conference, Part 6 of 8

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA)

Uploaded by [The Future of Freedom Foundation](#)

(<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCqOG4zIDmbIUk12Fzwg5tLA>) on Thu Sep 06 2007.

Daniel Ellsberg on "Iran and Iraq: The Need for Pentagon Papers" at the Future of Freedom Foundation's <http://fff.org> Restoring the Republic, 2007.

Daniel Ellsberg was born in Detroit in 1931. After graduating from Harvard in 1952 with a B. A. summa cum laude in Economics, he studied for a year at King's College, Cambridge University, on a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship.

Playlist of Ellsberg's lecture: http://www.youtube.com/view_play_list?p=5FFB8C4C61A02CF6

[00:00:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA)

clearly if it came up again which I am sure it will with another 911 this president will not veto it and the Democrats will not probably vote against after 911 and so forth and we'll have an official secrets act now what difference will that make if everybody thinks it's there already as I did at the first time I assumed I was violating such an act and that I'll go to jail forever because 7,000 pages and so on on that it was until a year into the trial that my lawyer said we've been doing research on this including unrecorded cases energy to see what the precedent for this trial is he said as far as we can there is no precedent such as far as we can make out you haven't poked in any law including at that time I was also charged with theft or conversion but as of the laws of that time is Melville nimmer wrote in a law review article you can't steal information you're not depriving the owner if he owns it of the use of that information there are copyright laws but those are civil laws for tort for damages so I hadn't violated those either or conspiracy said you haven't broken any law so I said and that's what other lawyers can do well great you know so I'm home free here then said no it's it's not as simple as that says if the u.s. goes into the attorney goes into the court and says the jury United States versus Daniel Ellsberg 12 felony counts and so you can't be sure you'll walk out of that place a free man and I said well what are my odds said Oh 5050 I said 5050 you know 115 years I was a

[00:02:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=121s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=121s)

I said 5050 you know 115 years I was a senior and I haven't broken any law he said well let's face it down copping 7,000 pages of top secret documents and giving them to the New York Times has a bad ring to it and uh which I could see so the the glory in n of our system is I would say that I hadn't broken the law at that point although it may well be that with new judgments by the new Supreme Court and by others and actually the law has evolved in the direction of interpreting this as illegal in the last 20 years or so and this Court would probably almost sure to go along with them and I would break it if the situation arose again it seemed to me right but as of that time I hadn't broken any law amazing wonderful country I would have said since I'd done the right thing it seemed to me and I shouldn't go to prison for but the law has evolved in a number of ways the things that were done against me going into the doctor's office sneak and peek it's now called is Leo without a warrant under the Patriot Act know many things the NSA surveillance or surveillance at that time was FBI illegal now but it's done and not being challenged no hearings by Congress no nothing it's not being challenged used to the CIA legal against domestic citizens under the Patriot so the various reasons that led Nixon to break laws in order to silence me and then had to break new laws in obstruction of justice to keep his own criminal involvement secret eventually got tangled up in an independent judiciary with a special prosecutor which I'm sorry to say we don't have no

[00:04:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=241s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=241s)

which I'm sorry to say we don't have no animal people agree with that but I would I'm sorry we don't have them despite its misuse in various times in the past that did of course bring Nixon out of office facing impeachment and possible prosecution if he hadn't been pardoned and made it possible to end the war Nixon would have continued the bombing had he not been removed from office even if Congress had cut the money off Reagan after all did face a cut off of money for terrorists in Nicaragua which he was financing and he found the money otherwise I'm constitutionally from the Sultan of Bahrain and from Saudi Arabia and from Iran a terrorist state by selling arms to them we found the money not appropriated by Congress well Nixon would have done that I think he would have invented that sooner than Reagan but nevertheless it was possible with that entanglement that came right from a constitution basically from observing it in the end that did in fact make it possible for Congress at last to cut off funding after the troops were and in the war I think we're facing three major crises right now there's been a lot of talk here more than one would find in almost any other group of defects in our system of government even going back indeed to the Constitution which had a lot of defects slavery for one major but still many many wonderful aspects which I've come to appreciate much more than I ever did before the separation of powers article 1 section 8 almost totally discarded by Democrats and Republicans alike now which puts the power of getting into or into congressional hands not to president sentence but presidents

[00:06:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=360s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=360s)

not to president sentence but presidents have been slashing at that ever since if somebody pointed out Harry Truman I thought Taft was wrong at that time to denounce Truman for his precedent he was creating he I was wrong Taft was right and Harry Truman was wrong created a terrible precedent so various aspects like that including them of course the Bill of Rights and the impeachment clause which is now regarded as Oh impeachment off the table the three crises were facing our Iraq but that's a rolling crisis my own opinion is that neither Democrats no Republicans will get us out of Iraq when it comes to keeping bases there Hillary has virtually Hillary Clinton is richly promise has said explicitly she would keep them there I won't go into that she would not get all the troops out she'd this was March thirteenth reported March 14th the New York Times looked it up on google it's very woody she explicitly came out and said I would not get all the troops out of there well she's not alone on that that is the Pelosi bill that's what many other people are coming and the President himself is no talking about considering plans for cutting things down in half staying in the bases in Kurdistan near Baghdad the Green Zone the various other bases preventing the country from going into chaos preventing Turkey from coming into courtesy and various other interests that involve keeping our bases in the oil regions forever I think when the president said through Tony Snow two days ago and Gates said yesterday that he thinks Korea remember that is a good model is a good model we're talking 50 in 60 years and I've been saying that for the last couple of years that's what I think is likely of course I'm struggling against it I would like not that not to happen I think that is what is likely to happen in elected a democrat will not change that in my opinion second I just have a

[00:08:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=481s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fkvTy6D_zrA&t=481s)

that in my opinion second I just have a minute left here I'll have to speak very rubbery I'm going to take two minutes I'm sorry and second Iran there are those people that I respect Robert Scheer for example I respect his opinion in most things on such things more than mine or as much as mine and others who think that is zero probability now I disagree it's true it would be insanity it's true that it would be you know I don't even have I don't have time to go through but you know all the reasons work that would be terrible terrible effect in its consequences should be off the table and yet the Democrats like the Republicans have been saying it's on the table including the use of nuclear weapons if necessary well that could be just fraga Toshio and bargaining and so forth I don't happen to think that's the case so I'm still very worried about it I think there is a significant probably high above zero than the next 18 months we will see this president decide to launch an attack will respond to some provocation and attack by the Israelis or something by a terror attack or something and go after Iran with even greater catastrophic effects than the attack of Iraq and third I've been

describing most of this time a real crisis to our Constitution now I don't have but I've pretty much indicated where I think that is if someone were to say that crisis is over it's not a crisis now the Democrats have accepted it we're going to have a precedent for years for this stuff it's not being opposed you'll be hard to to oppose that it's too late chalmers johnson thinks that I think he's saying in effect what EP tones and says in a to paraphrase chalmers johnson and nemesis we don't have a military-industrial complex

END